Niveau(x) d'enseignement : 3 Numéro EDUQ : 9170502
Centre d'intérêt : 140

Adiv, Ellen.

Development and application of an instrument designed to establish profiles of non-inner city schools with special needs / Ellen Adiv, Franceen R. Handelsman. -- [Montréal] : Commission des écoles protestants du Grand Montréal, Research Department, 1989.
vi, 83 p. ; 28 cm.

Résumé en français et en anglais : p. ii-vi. Bibliogr. : p. 57-62.

Vedette(s)-secondaire(s) : Handelsman, Franceen R. • Commission des écoles protestantes du Grand Montréal. Research Department

Descripteur(s) : Ecole • Evaluation de l'établissement • Analyse de besoins • Primaire (Ordre d'enseignement)

Le but de cette étude est de développer et d'expérimenter un outil ayant pour but d'établir le profil d'une école à partir d'un grand éventail de facteurs se rapportant à l'environnement familial des élèves et à leurs expériences scolaires précédentes, d'examiner le rapport existant entre ce profil et le rendement scolaire des élèves de l'école et d'essayer de voir si ces profils peuvent fournir une base équitable pour le classement des écoles de milieux non défavorisés qui requièrent des services supplémentaires. Trois écoles primaires du secteur anglais de la CEPGM ont participé à ce projet. L'outil se compose de quatre sections: 1. un questionnaire adressé aux parents; 2. un formulaire de renseignements sur l'élève adressé aux enseignants; 3. une série de tests de rendement en anglais et en mathématiques; 4. un inventaire de services scolaires à compléter par la direction de l'école. Les résultats de cette étude suggèrent que l'outil développé ici a la capacité de révéler des différences entre écoles sans la préparation de profils scolaires détaillés et que, si une école offre à la fois la voie régulière anglaise et la voie d'immersion française, il serait avantageux d'établir deux profils indépendants pour ces deux secteurs.

Type de document :

Development and Application of an Instrument Designed to Establish Profiles of Non-Inner City Schools with Special Needs

Ellen Adiv

Franceen R. Handelsman

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible by a research grant from the School Council of the Island of Montreal to the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

We would like to express our gratitude to the principals, the teachers and the administrative staff of the participating schools for their cooperation throughout the project. Sincere thanks go to Joan Fitzpatrick, Consultant Inner City schools and to Ann MacLeish, Regional Director, for their generous assistance. Last but not least, we would like to extend a word of appreciation to the students and the parents who took part in this research.

Résumé

Le but de cette étude était (1) de développer et d'expérimenter un outil ayant pour but d'établir le profil d'une école à partir d'un grand évantail de facteurs se rapportant à l'environnement familial des élèves et à leurs expériences scolaires précédentes, (2) d'examiner le rapport existant entre ce profil et le rendement scolaire des élèves de l'école et (3) d'essayer de voir si ces profils peuvent fournir une base équitable pour le classement des écoles de milieux non-défavorisés qui requièrent des services supplémentaires.

Trois écoles primaires du secteur anglais de la C.E.P.G.M. ont participé à ce projet. Toutes ces écoles étaient des écoles de milieux non-défavorisés. Deux d'entre elles (Ecole No 1 et Ecole No 2) étaient des écoles suivant un programme régulier anglais. La troisième école avait un secteur suivant un programme anglais régulier (Ecole No 3E) et un secteur suivant un programme d'immersion française (Ecole No 3F).

programmes et l'Ecole 3F avait le pourcentage le plus bas des quatre écoles; (5) dans les quatre écoles, le pourcentage d'élèves dont la performance au niveau de la classe était satisfaisante était généralement plus élevé parmi ceux qui avaient frequenté la même école depuis la maternelle que parmi ceux qui étaient venus plus tard à cette école.

Les résultats de cette étude suggèrent que (1) l'outil développé ici a la capacité de révéler des différences entre écoles qui ne sont pas apparentes sans la préparation de profils scolaires détaillés et (2) si une école offre à la fois la voie régulière anglaise et la voie d'immersion française, il serait avantageux d'établir deux profils indépendants pour ces deux secteurs.

Résumé

Le but de cette étude était (1) de développer et d'expérimenter un outil ayant pour but d'établir le profil d'une école à partir d'un grand évantail de facteurs se rapportant à l'environnement familial des élèves et à leurs expériences scolaires précédentes, (2) d'examiner le rapport existant entre ce profil et le rendement scolaire des élèves de l'école et (3) d'essayer de voir si ces profils peuvent fournir une base équitable pour le classement des écoles de milieux non-défavorisés qui requièrent des services supplémentaires.

Trois écoles primaires du secteur anglais de la C.E.P.G.M. ont participé à ce projet. Toutes ces écoles étaient des écoles de milieux non-défavorisés. Deux d'entre elles (Ecole No 1 et Ecole No 2) étaient des écoles suivant un programme régulier anglais. La troisième école avait un secteur suivant un programme anglais régulier (Ecole No 3E) et un secteur suivant un programme d'immersion française (Ecole No 3F).

L'outil se composait de quatre sections: (1) un questionnaire adressé aux parents, (2) un formulaire de renseignements sur l'élève adressé aux enseignants/enseignantes, (3) une serie de tests de rendement en anglais et en mathématiques et (4) un inventaire de services scolaires à compléter par la direction de l'école.

Les résultats indiquent que (1) proportionnellement il y avait nettement plus de familles mono-parentales dans les Ecoles No 2 et No 3E que dans les Ecoles No 1 et No 3F; (2) les Ecoles No 2 et No 3E semblaient avoir un pourcentage plus élevé d'élèves vivant dans des conditions socio-économiques difficiles que les Ecoles No 1 et No 3F et, dans l'ensemble, l'Ecole No 2 semblait avoir le plus haut pourcentage de ces élèves; (3) le rendement scolaire des élèves des Ecoles No 2 et No 3 était inférieur à celui des élèves de l'Ecole No 1 et, dans les trois écoles, le rendement scolaire était inférieur à celui des élèves de l'Ecole 3F; (4) l'Ecole No 1 avait proportionnellement le plus grand nombre d'élèves originaires d'autres écoles ou d'autres

programmes et l'Ecole 3F avait le pourcentage le plus bas des quatre écoles; (5) dans les quatre écoles, le pourcentage d'élèves dont la performance au niveau de la classe était satisfaisante était généralement plus élevé parmi ceux qui avaient frequenté la même école depuis la maternelle que parmi ceux qui étaient venus plus tard à cette école.

Les résultats de cette étude suggèrent que (1) l'outil développé ici a la capacité de révéler des différences entre écoles qui ne sont pas apparentes sans la préparation de profils scolaires détaillés et (2) si une école offre à la fois la voie régulière anglaise et la voie d'immersion française, il serait avantageux d'établir deux profils indépendants pour ces deux secteurs.

Summary

The purpose of this study was (1) to develop and pilot an instrument designed to draw up school profiles based on a broad range of factors related to the students' home background and previous schooling experience, (2) to examine the relationship between this school profile and the academic performance of the students in the school and (3) to try and see if such profiles provide an equitable base for ranking of non-Inner City schools who request additional services.

Three elementary schools from the English sector of the P.S.B.G.M. participated in the project. All of these schools were non-Inner City schools. Two of them (Schools 1 and 2) were regular English medium schools. The third one comprised two sections: a regular English stream (School 3E) and a French immersion stream (School 3F).

The instrument contained four parts: (1) a questionnaire addressed to the parents, (2) a pupil information form addressed to the teachers (3) a battery of English language and mathematics tests and (4) a survey of school-related services to be completed by the principal.

The main findings were as follows: (1) Schools 2 and 3E had a considerably larger proportion of students living in single-parent homes than Schools 1 and 3F; (2) Schools 2 and 3E appeared to have a greater p.rcentage of students living under difficult socio-economic conditions than Schools 1 and 3F and, overall, School 2 seemed to have the biggest proportion of such students; (3) academic achievement was lower in Schools 2 and 3E than in School 1 and, in all three schools, it was lower than in School 3F; (4) the proportion of students transferring from other schools and/or programs was highest in School 1 and lowest in School 3F; (5) in all four schools, the percentage of students who performed satisfactorily in the classroom was generally higher among students who had attended the same school from kindergarten than among those who had transferred into the school at a later stage.

The results of this study suggest that (1) the instrument developed here has the capacity to reveal differences between schools which are not apparent unless detailed profiles are drawn up and (2) when a school contains both a regular English stream and a French immersion stream, it seems advisable to draw up separate profiles for these two sectors.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Socio-Economic and Ethno-Cultural Factors 1

The Transfer of Students from Different Types of Schools 6

The Integration of Exceptional Students in Regular Classes 7

The Study 10

Methodology 11
- The Schools 11
- The Instrument 13
- Procedures 16

Results 18
- The Parent Questionnaire 18
- The Pupil Information Form 29
- The CTBS Results 41
- The Survey of School Related Services 44

Summary and Discussion 47

References 57

Tables 63

In recent years, several schools belonging to the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal (P.S.B.G.M.), particularly those that do not fall within the category of Inner City schools, find themselves in a position whereby the resources at their disposal are insufficient to meet the needs of their students.

Three major factors have given rise to the new reality which has come into being in these schools: (1) the growing proportion of children from low income homes, many of whom belong to ethnic minority groups; (2) the influx of students who transfer from schools or programs which are too demanding for them and (3) the integration of exceptional students into regular classrooms. Not all of these factors affect every school to the same degree, however, since each of them may influence the academic achievement as well as the affective well-being of students, it seems relevant to look at all three in some detail.

(1) Socio-Economic and Ethno-Cultural Factors

The relationship between socio-economic level and scholastic achievement has been thoroughly documented (see Miller, 1971, for a review of some of the relevant literature) and the need to raise the academic level of students

from low-income homes has been widely recognized. In consequence, schools which are located in areas where conditions of poverty prevail (Inner City schools) usually receive additional funds which are used to implement various types of intervention programs (see Les interventions pédagogiques en milieux économiques faibles: Expériences américaines et autres, 1984).

However, many pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged (hereafter SED) homes attend schools which are not officially recognized as Inner City schools. It has been argued that these schools do not need special provisions for their SED students because the contact with middle class children is in itself sufficient to produce the desired result. On the other hand, this criterion does not seem to apply to contexts where the proportion of SED students is very high as is the case in many P.S.B.G.M. schools. A longitudinal study carried out in a number of non-Inner City elementary schools belonging to the English sector of this School Board (Adiv and Doré, 1985; Adiv and Boltuc, 1986, 1987) shows that the SED students in these schools consistently score lower than their non-SED peers on standardized language and mathematics tests. The results also indicate that differences in achievement between SED and non-SED students tend to be more pronounced in the upper grades,

suggesting that SED pupils may find it increasingly more difficult to cope with their school work if they do not receive additional pedagogical support.

A more socio-cultural oriented factor which seems to affect scholastic performance is the educational expectations parents have of their children. Research conducted during the fifties in Europe and the United States suggests that low income parents have fewer aspirations for their children and exert less pressure on them in this domaine than middle class parents (Halsey and Gardner, 1953; Schoenell, 1956). This hypothesis may also be applicable in immersion versus regular English school settings. Norman Mayer, coordinator of curriculum assessment in Manitoba's Department of Education notes that the consistently superior performance of French immersion students on English language tests may be attributable to characteristics in the home environment. He argues that parents of students in French immersion schools may provide, on the average, more encouragement than those of students in regular English schools and that this can lead to better performance (reported in the Montreal Gazette, May 24th, 1989). Although socio-economic factors are not directly cited here, the findings suggest that this point should be taken into consideration when schools which contain a French immersion sector as well as a regular English sector are studied.

Another aspect of the home environment that seems to have a negative effect on academic achievement is the disruption of the normal family framework as is the case when separation and divorce occur or when a step-parent enters the picture (Fraser, 1955; Schonell, 1956). The importance of this factor in future research is underscored by the frequency with which these situations occur in today's society.

The effect of the ethno-cultural factor on scholastic performance has been studied primarily in the United States where it was found that black students in desegregated classes scored significantly higher on standardized tests than students who attended segregated classes (Stallings, 1959; Anderson, 1966; Coleman et al., 1966, Sullivan, 1968). However, it was also noted that the academic achievement of blacks was directly related to the racial composition of the class (McPartland, 1969) and that the positive effect of desegregation was only evidenced when the proportion of blacks in the school did not exceed 60% (Cohen, Pettigrew and Riley, 1972).

In Montreal, the difficulties encountered by students from different ethnic backgrounds are often enhanced by the fact that these students have to study in a language other than their mother tongue. This issue is particularly

pronounced in the French sector of th P.S.B.G.M. where most of the students are non-native French speakers. Research into the academic achievement of these students at various grade levels (Adiv, 1982; Adiv and Doré, 1983, 1984) reveals that their mathematics skills are at the same level as those of their francophone peers, whereas their French language development continues to lag even after a number of years in the French school milieu. Moreover, the achievement in French of the francophone students in these classes seems to suffer by comparison to that of native French speakers who attend classes where the proportion of ethnic minority students is considerably lower (Adiv and Doré, 1982).

The ethno-cultural factor is, of course, also present in Montreal's English medium schools although, here, the issues are usually not linguistic ones since admission to these schools is restricted to students whose mother tongue is English. To date, no studies have been conducted to look at the possible influence of the ethnic dimension on scholastic performance in the P.S.B.G.M.'s English sector. However, findings from the above mentioned longitudinal study suggest that the socio-economic factor is much more salient here than any of the variables associated with ethnicity.

(2) The Transfer of Students from Different Types of Schools

The transfer of students from one school to another is a common phenomenon in modern times. In most cases, these switches are due to families moving to new neighbourhoods and the receiving school has usually an instructional program similar to the one in the student's previous school. On the other hand, some of the P.S.B.G.M.'s English schools absorb a considerable number of students from schools with very different programs such as the French immersion programs or the trilingual and, sometimes quadrilingual, programs that are offered in certain parochial schools. Research into the efficacy of these programs has consistently shown that the burden of the additional language(s) has no detrimental effect on the development of English (mother tongue) skills and academic achievement in other subjects. (For summary reports on immersion programs, see Genesee, 1976, 1978; Lapkin and Swain, 1984. For the evaluation of some of the trilingual programs, see Genesee and Lambert, 1983; Adiv, 1984, 1989.) At the same time, there has been considerable discussion as to whether students experiencing difficulties in such programs should be switched to the regular English stream (Bruck, Rabinovitch and Oates, 1975; Trites, 1976). It has been argued that the failure to perform satisfactorily in these settings seems to stem

mostly from inherent learning and/or behavioral problems rather than from the nature of the program. Hence, merely transfering such students to a regular English school may not be an effective solution (Bruck, 1978).

(3) The Integration of Exceptional Students in Regular Classes

The development of educational services for exceptional children in the public school system dates back to the 1960s. However it is only during the latter half of the seventies that a comprehensive statement of policy has been issued by the Quebec Ministry of Education to that effect. The policy recognizes the right of these students - referred to as children with difficulties in learning and adaptation - to public education in as normal a social environment as possible (The Schools of Quebec, Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec, 1979). The major areas of difficulty are defined as follows: learning problems, mental deficiency, sensory impairments, physical handicaps, socio-emotional problems and multiple deviations.

The Ministry's statement follows the same philosophical principle as the one underlying the American Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 which stipulates the right of exceptional children to be educated in the least

restrictive setting. The Quebec Ministry is less precise about the actual measures to be taken in order to ensure that students with difficulties in learning and adaptation are provided with the most appropriate educational setting. The P.S.B.G.M.'s policy on this issue has been to integrate exceptional children with regular students whenever possible (Consolidated Special Education Policy Statement, 1984). This conceptual framework encompasses a number of different settings ranging from full-time insertion into the regular classroom - often referred to as mainstreaming - to totally separate classes for severely handicapped students. Within these two extremes, there are a variety of models which differ from one another in the kind of support that is provided in or outside the regular classroom (e.g., free flow teachers, resource centers and learning style accommodations; see also Macmillan and Semmel, 1977).

Research into the efficacy of the various educational settings used with exceptional students show no consistent advantage of one model over others in terms of academic achievement (Smith and Kennedy, 1967; Glavin, Quay, Annesley and Werry, 1971; Wang and Birch, 1984a, 1984b; Affleck, Madge, Adams and Lowenbraun, 1988). On the other hand, informal assessments of mainstreaming practices emphasize the beneficial role that the contact between exceptional

children and students receiving regular education plays in the development of social skills (Gresham, 1981; Hanline and Murray, 1984; Noonan and Hemphill, 1984; Nelson, 1988).

A major issue for the integration of exceptional children into the regular classroom is the constant increase in the number of students with difficulties in learning and adaptation (Gerber, 1984). Afflek et al. (1988) state, in reference to this issue, that about one third of the students in their experimental classes were children with special needs. The problem is particularly acute in large-size classes. Meyen and Lehr (1980) claim that the pupil-teacher ratio in mainstreamed classes should be reduced to a maximum of 15 to 1 for at least half of the school day. When such an arrangement is not feasible, other alternatives must be considered. For instance, Afflek et al.'s classes, which had 24 students, benefitted from the help of a half-time aide.

The proportion of exceptional students in regular classrooms and the pupil-teacher ratio in these classes are also major concerns in the Montreal schools. A recent survey conducted by the P.S.B.G.M. (Ross and Rosenfield, 1988) shows that even with a pupil-teacher ratio of 30 to 1, close to half of the elementary schools of this Board would

need an additional teacher if more students from special education classes are to be integrated into regular classrooms.

To summarize, in the preceding section, some of the problems faced by many P.S.B.G.M. schools have been discussed and findings from related research have been presented to substantiate the claim that these schools need additional resources to provide an appropriate educational setting for all their students.

On the other hand, the budgetary restrictions which the P.S.B.G.M. faces severely limit the extent to which additional funds and services can be provided to the schools. In consequence, it seems essential to set up a framework within which priorities for the possible distribution of such funds and/or services can be determined.

The Study

The purpose of the study described in this report was to construct and test an instrument which could be used by the P.S.B.G.M. to draw up school profiles based on a broad range of characteristics of the student population.

Methodology

The Schools

Three elementary schools from the P.S.B.G.M.'s English sector participated in the study. All of these schools were non-Inner City schools. Two of them (hereafter School 1 and School 2) were medium sized schools with 298 and 240 students respectively. The third one was a large school which comprised two sections: a regular English stream with 204 students and a French immersion stream with 313 students. Since one of the issues addressed in this study is the transfer of students from programs such as French immersion to the English stream, it was decided to collect and process the data from each section separately and to refer to the English section as School 3E and to the French immersion section as School 3F.

The three schools were located in different types of neighborhoods. School 1 was situated in a predominantly middle to upper middle class area. However, practically all of the school's students were bussed from other neighborhoods and many of these localities were not of the same socio-economic level. Schools 2 and 3 were situated in working class neighborhoods but, here again, many of the students were bussed from other areas, several of which were low income ones. The fact that the students came from many

different neighborhoods also accounts for the presence of a sizeable proportion of students from various ethno-cultural backgrounds in each of these schools.

All the schools in this sample comprised the full range of grade levels from kindergarten through grade 6 except for School 3E which had no kindergarten class at the time the study was conducted. The number of classes at each grade level varied, however, from school to school. This factor is particularly salient when School 1 and School 3F are compared. In the latter school, the pattern was one of a broad based triangle with three classes at the kindergarten level, two classes at each level in grades 1 - 3 and one to one and a half classes in the upper grades. In contrast, in School 1, the pattern was reversed, i.e., there was only one class at each level in the lower grades whereas there were two to two and half classes in the upper grades (see Table 1, for the exact number of students at each grade level).

In addition, all three schools had a number of special education classes which served children with severe learning and/or emotional problems from the areas covered by these schools as well as children sent there from other neighboring P.S.B.G.M. schools. School 1 had 43 such students, Schools 2 and 3 had 31 and 36 respectively. Quite a number of these children were integrated with regular education

students in non-core subjects (e.g. physical education), but only few were accommodated in the regular classroom for core subjects such as mathematics and English. Schools 1 and 2 had respectively 6 and 10 of these students. School 3 had at the time only two such students because of lack of space at the appropriate grade level.

The Instrument

The instrument consisted of four parts: (1) a questionnaire to be completed by the parents, (2) a pupil information form, (3) a battery of achievement tests and (4) a survey of school-related services.

(1) The Parent Questionnaire

The questinnaire contained 31 items. Most of them required yes/no or multiple-choice responses. The purpose of the parent questionnaire was to elicit data which relates primarily to linguistic and cultural characteristics in the home although, indirectly, it also provided information on the family's socio-economic condition. Slightly over one third of the questions dealt with the parents' own background (birth place, level of education, etc.) and their daily routines (work patterns, participation in community activities, etc.). The other questions were more directly

related to contexts which involve also the children (language spoken in the home, trips and sports activities undertaken with the participation of the children, etc.). The questionnaire was completely anonymous. An accompanying letter explained the purpose of the questionnaire and gave details about the return procedures.

(2) The Pupil Information Form

This form was to be completed by the classroom teacher for each of his or her students. The form contained 14 questions most of which required just yes/no or multiple-choice answers. The questions can be grouped into three categories: (a) questions pertaining to the student's home situation, (b) questions related to academic performance and emotional/behavioral characteristics and (c) questions pertaining to the student's previous schooling experience. In addition, the teachers were requested to write their own comments wherever relevant.

(3) The Achievement Tests

The battery of achievement tests used in this study was The Canadian Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, Nelson, 1987). The test has the advantage of having a Canadian orientation in terms of cultural content. On the other hand, it has a

number of limitations which should be borne in mind. First, it uses a discrete-item approach which is not in keeping with the underlying philosophy of the new curriculum used in the Quebec schools. This is particularly relevant with respect to language skills because the Quebec program uses a "whole language approach". Secondly, the standardization of the test scores is based on a proportional sample of students in English medium schools from each province in Canada. Since the representation of Quebec in the total sample is relatively small, the national norms may not be fully representative of Quebec averages. Nevertheless, it is felt that the tests provide the best available basis for comparing the academic achievement of different groups of students in the P.S.B.G.M.'s English medium schools.

Each test in the battery consists of a number of multiple-choice items and, in the lower grades (kindergarten - grade 2), many of the stimulus items are read out aloud by the teacher which minimizes the influence of reading skills on the test results in other subject areas.

Three areas of academic achievement were assessed in the study: vocabulary, reading and mathematics. The latter included concepts, problem solving and computation.

(4) The Survey of School-Related Services

This part of the instrument elicited information about the availability of services that help meet the needs of students who are experiencing difficulties in school. The survey was addressed to the principals who were asked to check off from a listing of resources those that were available in their schools. The principals were also requested to differentiate between those services which were adequately provided and those which were available but were not extensive enough to meet their school's needs. Space was provided to list additional resources the school may require and which were not mentioned in the survey. In the second section of the form, the principals were asked to list the services which they had marked as either "insufficient" or "not provided" according to their priorities.

Procedures

The parent questionnaire, the pupil information sheet and the survey of school-related services were distributed in November 1988.

The parent questionnaires were enclosed in sealed envelopes which were sent home and returned to the school with the students. Since each student was given an envelope,

BASE DE DONNÉES INFORMATISÉE SUR

LA RECHERCHE-DÉVELOPPEMENT QUÉBÉCOISE EN ÉDUCATION

AUTORISATION DE REPRODUCTION

(s'il vous plaît, veuillez remplir un formulaire par document)

AUTEUR(S): (1) Adiv and (2) Adiv - Handelsman

TITRE: (1) Introducing instructional strategies based on Gurney styles

ÉDITEUR: (2) Development and Application of an Instrument Designed to Establish School Profiles

---

DISPONIBILITÉ

- Ce document est présentement en vente chez l'éditeur .....

  Numéro ISBN .....

- Ce document n'est pas présentement en vente .....

AUTORISATION

- J'accepte que ce document soit microfiché sans frais de ma part

  ☒ oui (veuillez signer la formule ci-dessous)

  ☐ non

- J'autorise, sans exiger de droits d'auteur, Services documentaires multimedia (SDM) à reproduire et à distribuer sur une base non lucrative, dans le cadre de la base de données ÉDUQ, les microfiches du document ci-haut mentionné.

Signature E. Adiv Date 22 Nov 1990

	Retourner à:
Nom et prénom du répondant	ÉDUQ
(en lettres moulées s.v.p.)	Services documentaires multimedia
Adresse ELLEN ADIV	1685, rue Fleury Est
CEPGM	Montréal, Québec
6000 Fielding	H2C 1T1
Montréal Québec H3X 1T4	

parents with more than one child in school received several forms. These parents were asked to complete only one form and to return the others blank. The completed and incompleted forms were to be returned in the same envelope to ensure that the data provided by the parents was extended to all the children in that family.

The pupil information forms were given to the classroom teachers. Substitutes were provided to free these teachers from their regular duties during the time needed to complete the forms. The teachers were asked to consult the principal on questions for which they did not have the necessary information. In order to keep the data confidential, the teachers used code numbers instead of names on the forms.

The CTBS were administered at all grade levels except kindergarten. Special education classes were, however, excluded since data pertaining to the standardized measurement of the academic achievement of these students is readily available. Students in grades 3-6 were tested in February with the exception of the grade 3 students in school 3F. The latter were tested in May because English language skills are only introduced in the French immersion program at the beginning of grade 3. Students in grades 1 and 2 were also tested in May because it was felt that February was too early in the year to assess such young

learners. The grade 1 and grade 2 students in School 3F were not included in the testing since their academic program is taught entirely in French.

Results

(1) The Parent Questionnaire

Demographic Data

In all, 1055 parent questionnaires were distributed; however, since parents had only to complete one questionnaire per family, it is essential to look at the actual number of family units in the sample. According to the figures provided by the schools at the time the study was conducted, there were 227 families in School 1, 165 families in School 2, 163 families in School 3E and 225 families in School 3F. Moreover, there were 30 families who had children in School 3E as well as in School 3F. Fully 88% of the families completed the questionnaires. The proportion was highest in School 1 (97%) followed in descending order by School 3F (89%), School 3E (82%) and School 2 (81%).

Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were mothers, 17% were fathers and 2% were relatives or guardians. The remaining 2% did not indicate who had completed the form.

Fourteen parents stated that the mother and the father had answered the questionnaire together; however, since each of these families had handed in only one questionnaire, these cases were recorded as having been completed by the mother.

More than one third of the families (37%) who completed the questionnaires were mono-parental ones. The proportion of such homes was considerably higher in School 2 and in School 3E (47% in each case) than in the other two schools (School 3F = 31% and School 1 = 27%). In practically all the single-parent homes (98%) the mother was the head of the family.

Eighty percent of the families had more than one child. In Schools 1 and 3F, most of these families had two children (47% and 49% respectively), whereas in the other two schools the families tended to be larger. This was particularly evident in School 2 where 48% of them comprised three or more children (for further details, see Table 2, Item 3). Most of the parents (84%) had all their school-age children enrolled in P.S.B.G.M. schools (for exact figures in each school, see Table 2, Item 4). Among those who attended other institutions, there were some, particularly in School 1 (16%), who went to private schools.

Less than half of the respondents were native Quebecers. The percentage of parents born outside Canada was highest in School 2 (68%) and lowest in Schools 3E and 3F (41% and 42% respectively). There were also some parents (8%) who were Canadians that had moved here from another province. However, the majority of all these people (86%) had been residing in Quebec for over 10 years.

Languages Spoken in the Home

As could be expected, English was the main language spoken in most of the homes (School 1 = 84%, School 2 = 89%, School 3E = 95% and School 3F = 91%). Among the other families, French, Hebrew, Arabic, languages from countries in the Far East such as Korean, Vietnamese or Chinese, and regional languages such as Fante, Banglia or Patua, constituted the first home language. Slightly over one fourth of the parents spoke more than one language with their children. French was most frequently cited as a second language in the home and the proportion of bilingual English/French homes was particularly high (26%) in School 3F. Other languages included English (for those who did not speak it as their first language), regional tongues and a broad range of European and Asian languages. In some homes (19%), these languages constituted a third means of communication in addition to English and French.

Educational Background of the Parents

There were considerable differences among the schools in terms of the parents' educational background. Thirty-nine percent of the mothers in School 1 had a university education whereas only 21% of the mothers in School 3F, 16% of those in School 3E and 11% of those in School 2 had attended university. Among the parents in these three schools, high school was most frequently quoted as the highest educational level attained (48% in School 3E, 45% in School 3F and 44% in School 2). The number of mothers who had not gone beyond elementary school was relatively small. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile noting that there were more such cases in School 2 (13%) than in the other schools (School 3E = 9%; School 1 = 7%; School 3F = 6%).

The level of education of the fathers was generally higher than that of the mothers and in all the schools, except School 3E, the number of fathers who had attended university exceeded those who did not go beyond high school. These findings must, however, be accepted cautiously because of the small number of fathers in the sample. The proportion of parents who had attended a CEGEP but nothing beyond that was relatively small (15%) which may reflect the fact that many of the respondents were not native Quebecers and may, therefore, not have had the opportunity to attend a CEGEP.

Some parents (11%) indicated that they had attended an institution other than a CEGEP or university after high school. The most frequently cited institutions were vocational schools, commercial colleges, nursing schools and adult education programs.

Parents' Work Patterns

More than half of the mothers held either full-time or part-time jobs and practically all of them worked outside the home (see Table 2, Items 12-13). The proportion of mothers who worked full-time was highest in School 3F (56%) and lowest in School 1 (33%). Approximately one third of the mothers did not work at all, including some who were full-time students.

The percentage of fathers holding full-time jobs was, of course, much higher. In Schools 1, 3E and 3F, over 90% of the fathers were working full-time. On the other hand, in School 2, this category encompassed only 84% of the fathers. School 2 had also the highest rate of unemployed fathers (11%). For further details, see Table 2, Items 14-15).

Socio-Cultural Features

Two sets of features related to the socio-cultural environment of the home were examined: reading habits and

participation in community activities. With respect to reading habits, three fourths of the parents indicated that they read a daily newspaper and the between-group differences were not very large (School 1 = 80%, School 3E = 75%, Schools 2 and 3F = 71% each). Seventy one percent of the parents also reported that they read magazines or periodicals on a regular basis. Here, the difference among some of the schools were somewhat more pronounced (School 1 = 75%, School 2 = 70%, School 3E = 61%, School 3F - 73%. Interestingly, there were proportionally more parents who reported not reading a daily paper than there were parents who recorded not reading any magazines or periodicals (compare Items 16 and 17 on Table 2). Most parents also said that they had many books at home and, as in the case of newspaper reading, the differences among the schools were not very big here (School 1 = 94%, School 2 = 90%, School 3E = 86%, School 3F = 93%).

Approximately half of the parents indicated that they participated in organized community activities. Adult education classes were most frequently cited here and there were no significant differences on this item among the four groups (see Table 2, Item 19). Other community organized activities were dances which were attended much less frequently in School 1 (5%) than in the other three schools (School 2 = 13%, School 3E = 13% and School 3F = 15%) and

bingo which was more popular in Schools 3E and 3F (13% and 9% respectively) than in Schools 1 and 2 (3% and 6% respectively). Some parents also listed various types of volunteer work such as organizing bazaars, working with children after school, coaching sports teams etc. Others cited activities related to the performing arts, such as attending concerts or taking part in drama groups. Participation in all these types of activities was highest in School 3F (15%) and lowest in School 3E (3%).

Parental Involvement in School Activities

Three facets of parental involvement in school activities were examined: presence at school or home-and-school committee meetings, participation in school projects and attendance at meet-the-teacher evenings and parent-teacher interviews. The results show that the interest was directed primarily towards parent-teacher meetings. In three of the schools, more than 90% of the parents reported that they attended such meetings (School 1 = 95%, School 3E = 92%, School 3F = 93%). In School 2, the proportion was considerably lower though still substantial (84%).

With respect to involvement in school (or home-and-school) committee meetings, overall, only 30% of the parents indicated that they attended such meetings. Here, participa-

tion was highest in School 2 (36%) and lowest in School 3E (24%).

Participation in school projects was even lower. Only 20% of all the parents said thay had been involved in a school project over the past two years and here, again, the percentage was lowest in School 3E (15%, see also Table 2, Item 20).

Family Activities

In contrast to the items presented in the preceding sections which referred mostly to personal characteristics of the parents, the items in this section focus on endeavors in which the children of the family often participate.

Three types of activities of this nature were investigated; sports, travel patterns and visits to the dentist.

Sports

Sports activities were classified into four major categories: (a) outdoor sports that require a certain amount of personal equipment such as tennis, cycling, skating and skiing, (b) outdoor sports that do not require special equipment such as running and swimming, (c) outdoor sports

that require minimal equipment such as volleyball, netball and soccer and (d) indoor sports such as gymnastics, karate and boxing. When parents listed more than one type of sport, these activities were recorded separately if they belonged to different categories (e.g., swimming and cycling); however, if they belonged to the same category, they were recorded only once (e.g., soccer and volleyball). The data for each category was then analyzed independently from that in the other categories.

The results show that the percentage of families engaging in sports that require some personal equipment was highest in School 1 (72%) followed in descending order by School 3F (63%), School 3E (55%) and School 2 (47%). The pattern was similar for sports requiring no equipment. However, here some of the differences between the groups were less pronounced because, in Schools 2 and 3E, the proportion of parents who indicated that they engaged in the latter category of sports was higher (School 1 = 71%, School 3F =62%, School 3E = 60% and School 2 = 55%). Participation in sports requiring only minimal equipment (predominently ball games) was much lower and there were practically no differences here among the groups (School 1 = 17%, School 2 = 20%, School 3E = 19% and School 3F = 20%). Indoor sports were eveneven less frequently recorded and in all the schools, except School 1, participation in such activities was minimal (School 1 = 11%, School 2 = 2%, School 3E = 2% and School 3F = 5%).

Travel Patterns

Travel patterns were examined in terms of whether the trips were taken with or without the family and whether or not they occurred during the summer when children have an extended vacation. The duration of the trips and means of transportation were also taken into consideration. Over three fourths of the parents indicated thay they had traveled out of Montreal during the last year. The proportion was highest in School 3F (85%) and lowest in School 2 (72%). Most of the parents said that they had traveled with their families. Some indicated that they had taken more than one trip and had traveled sometimes alone and sometimes with their children. Overall, 72% of the respondents in School 1, 62% of those in School 2, 66% of those in School 3E and 77% of those in School 3F had traveled with their families during the past year. Nevertheless, there were quite a number of parents who indicated that they and their children usually spend the entire summer in Montreal. The percentage of these families was highest in School 2 (46%) followed in descending order by School 3E (37%) School 1 (35%) and School 3F (29%).

No clear pattern emerged in terms of the length of the trips. One third of the parents reported taking short trips of up to a week, 29% of them set the duration of their

family trips at two weeks and less than 10% of them took trips that lasted more than two weeks (for exact distributions across the schools, see Table 2, Item 25).

Cars were the most frequently used means of transportation. The proportion of families using cars by comparison to planes, trains and buses was highest in School 3F (75%) and lowest in School 2 (52%). Plane travel was next in popularity and the percentage of families using this mode of transportation was highest in School 1 (49%) and in School 2 (47%). Train and bus trips were much less frequent. Moreover, the groups did not differ significantly from one another in the extent to which they traveled by train (see Table 2, Item 26). On the other hand, the families in Schools 2 and 3E traveled much more often by bus (22% and 14% respectively) than those in Schools 1 and 3F (6% and 4% respectively).

Visits to the Dentist

There was great awareness among the parents to the need of dental care. Eighty eight percent of them indicated that they have a family dentist and another 7% said that they go to a dental clinic. The proportion of parents using a dental clinic was slightly higher in School 2 (12%) and in School 3E (11%) than in School 1 (5%) and in School 3F (6%).

Parents' Comments

Some parents added remarks of a general nature at the end of the questionnaire. Most of these expressed reactions to the questionnaire itself and these provide valuable feedback about the way this instrument was received in the students' homes. The comments show that the questionnaire was not perceived as an imposition. Some of the parents even stated that they enjoyed being involved in the project and that they appreciated the concern for the improvement of their children's academic environment. A number of parents used the opportunity to raise points which were not related to the issues at hand such as the desirability of school uniforms.

(2) The Pupil Information Form

The Home Situation

The first question in this section of the pupil information form dealt with the family setting in which each student lives. It paralleled, to some extent, Item 2 on the parent questionnaire which related to two-parent families vs. single-parent homes. However, there are additional categories here which cover foster or group homes and single parents with a partner living in the house. The data reveals that when the proportion of students living in two-parent

homes is compared across the two questionnaires, the figures are almost identical for each school (compare Item 1 on Table 3 with Item 2 on Table 2). On the other hand, the comparison of the figures pertaining to the proportion of students living in mono-parental homes varies slightly across the two questionnaires because of the additional categories on the pupil information form. Here, the results show that all the schools, except School 3F, had a few children living in foster or group homes (School 1 = 1%, School 2 = 3%, School 3E = 2%). Schools 1 and 3E also had some students living with a single parent and his or her new partner (2% in each case). Moreover, all four schools had a number of students staying with relatives or guardians. Schools 1 and 2 had the highest proportion of such cases (4% and 5% respectively).

Other questions pertaining to the home situation dealt with the dwelling conditions and whether or not the head of the family holds a steady job. The first question proved to be problematic because some teachers interpreted "poor dwelling conditions" to mean untidy homes rather than homes with inadequate housing facilities. Furthermore, in many cases, the teachers indicated that they simply did not have the relevant information. Overall, Schools 1 and 3F had noticeably higher proportions of students whose living conditions were considered to be adequate (78% and 74% respectively) than School 2 (61%) and School 3E (52%).

A similar pattern emerged with respect to work patterns of the family head. In Schools 1 and 3, more than four fifths of the heads of families held a steady job, whereas only 61% of those in School 2 and 66% of those in School 3E had stable employment.

An issue usually associated with steady income is the ability to pay school related expenses. Here the data indicate that as many as 38% of the students in School 2 found it difficult to come up with the necessary money. In Schools 1 and 3E, the problem was less pronounced though not negligeable (24% and 26% respectively). In contrast, in School 3F, only 9% of the students were noted to have difficulties in paying the school-related expenses.

Three other items which reflect conditions in the home were examined: (a) chronic absenteeism and/or tardiness, (b) signs of hunger and/or lack of sleep and (c) recourse to social services. The first two problems affected relatively few students. It is, however, noteworthy that School 1 had the highest number of such cases. It is also the only school where the percentage of students afflicted by these problems exceeded 10% in each category (for details, see Table 3, Items 5 and 6).

About 15% of the students and/or their families received some type of social support. However, the proportion of students who were getting such help was significantly lower in School 3F (4%) than in the other three schools (School 1 = 12%, School 2 = 14% and School 3E = 18%). The visit of a social worker in the home was the most frequent form of support provided and its occurrence was highest in School 3E (14%). A small number of students and their families received social services outside the home. Others had availed themselves of such services in the past. In some cases, the school had pointed out the need for a social worker to work with the child, but the matter had not been pursued by the family (for exact figures, see Table 3, Item 7). The teachers also indicated that they were only aware of the provision of social services in cases which involved their own students. Thus the actual number of families receiving such support may have been greater.

Other issues affecting the home situation were revealed in the teachers' comments. Chief among these were difficult relationships between members of the family, violence in the home and a generally disorganized homelife. All of these problems occurred most frequently in Schools 2 and 3E. Drugs, alcohol and chronic illness, both physical and mental, were also reported although their occurrence was less pronounced. The shifting of children from one parent to

another and sometimes onto a guardian was found to occur in quite a few single-parent homes. Instances of child abuse and child neglect were reported in all four schools; they were, however, more frequent in schools 1, 2 and 3E than in School 3F. It should be noted that, although only a small number of cases were recorded for each type of home situation, the combined effect is far from negligeable as will be shown below when the various factors affecting school performance are discussed.

Previous School History

The number of students who had previously attended another school either in Montreal or elsewhere varied considerably across the schools. In School 1, almost three fourths of the student population (74%) had joined the school at a grade level other than kindergarten. In Schools 2 and 3E, the figures were lower but still substantial (45% and 43% respectively). In contrast, only 15% of the students in School 3F had attended other schools previously.

Closer examination of the data reveals that, except for School 1, most of the students had transferred from another P.S.B.G.M. school (School 1 = 35%, School 2 = 57%, School 3E = 59%, School 3F = 60%). Most of those who had not previously attended a P.S.B.G.M. school came from another local

School Board (School 1 = 11%, School 2 = 19%, School 3E = 24%, School 3F = 40%), except in School 1 where the majority of the students (43%) had switched over from private parochial schools.

Relatively few students had started their studies outside Montreal. School 2 had the highest proportion of such students (18%) followed by Schools 1 and 3E (8% and 10% respectively). None of the students in School 3F fell into this category.

Finally, a small number of students in Schools 1, 2 and 3E came from special education centers. School 3F had no students here either which is natural since this school had no special education classes to receive such students (for exact figures, see Table 3, Item 9).

With respect to language of instruction, the majority of the schools which students in School 2 and 3E had previously attended were English medium schools. In School 2, 69% of the students who had come from other schools had been schooled in English irrespective of the locality of the institutions. In School 3E the proportion was even higher (80%). Conversely, in School 3F, most of the students had switched over from other French immersion schools (62%). In School 1, the numbers were equally divided between stu-

dents who had previously attended an English school and students who had studied in trilingual parochial schools (38% in each case). In addition, 11% of the students who had transferred into School 1 came from French immersion schools. Schools 2 and 3E also had quite a few students who had switched out of French immersion (14% and 10% respectively of all those who had come from other schools). On the other hand, the latter two schools as well as School 3F had practically no students from trilingual schools. Finally, some students had previously attended schools where the medium of instruction was neither English nor French (School 1= 7%, School 2 = 11%, School 3E = 4%, School 3F had no such students).

More than half of the students had switched schools during the past two years. The proportion of such students was especially high in School 2 (82% of all those who had come from other schools) followed, in descending order, by School 3F (68%), School 3E (67%) and School 1 (55%).

In addition to transfers from one school to another, there were also students who had switched programs within the same school. This type of transfer was most salient in School 3 because, here, it was possible to transfer from French immersion (School 3F) to the English stream (School 3E) within the same administrative unit. Other program

switches pertained to students who had previously attended special education classes, but were now fully integrated into regular classes. This type of transfer occurred most frequently in School 1. Overall, program switching involved only a small number of students except in School 3E where most of the transfers pertained to students from the French immersion program in School 3F (School 3E = 29%, School 1 = 12%, School 2 = 3%; School 3F had no students who had switched programs). Here, again, most of the changes took place during the past two years.

Another issue that the schools faced was a relatively high rate of students who were either presently repeating a grade or had done so in a previous grade (School 1 = 25%, School 2 = 12%, School 3E = 24%, School 3F = 6%). A substantial proportion of these students had doubled a year prior to being placed in a special education class (40% of the repeaters in School 1, 78% of those in School 2 and 21% of those in School 3E). Students switching out of trilingual and/or French immersion schools or programs constituted another category for whom repeating a year was a frequent occurrence. This factor was so salient that it affected the grade levels in which repeating occurred most often. In School 1, where the influx of students from the trilingual schools took place mostly in grades 3 and 4, the concentration of students, who were either presently repeating a

grade or had done so at a previous stage, was heavier in the upper grades than in the lower ones (34% of all the repeaters). In contrast, in School 3E, where most of the transfers from French immersion occured in grades 1 and 2, the percentage of repeaters in the upper grades was considerably smaller (15%).

Classroom Performance

According to the teachers' evaluations, fewer than half of the students in Schools 1, 2 and 3E (38%, 49% and 44% respectively) performed satisfactorily in class. On the other hand, close to three fourths of the students in School 3F (72%) experienced no difficulties with their school work. It must be borne in mind, however, that the group of students whose performance was judged to be unsatisfactory includes all the students in special education classes whose achievement is by definition below the expected norm. In School 3E, these children constituted close to one fifth of the student body (19%). In Schools 1 and 2, the percentage was considerably lower but still substantial (14% and 13% respectively). In School 3F, this issue did not arise since the school had no special education classes.

The teacher's comments as to the possible causes for poor scholastic achievement revealed five major types of

problems: (1) learning difficulties, (2) problems related to affective characteristics, (3) problems pertaining to language development, (4) health problems and (5) difficult home situations. Affective characteristics were further subdivided into (a) factors which relate directly to the learning process, such as motivation, and (b) factors which are more indirectly connected with scholastic achievement such as unmanageable behavior in the classroom. Sometimes, there was considerable overlap in the description of the different problems noted by the teachers. It was for this reason that some types of problems, e.g. concentration and motivation, were grouped into one category. In a similar vein, intellectual handicaps were classified together with learning difficulties. On the other hand, problems in language development pertained only to cases where poor language skills were not part of overall weak performance and were not attributable to identified learning difficulties. Often several types of problems were noted to occur simultaneously. This was particularly salient in the case of difficult home situations and various emotional problems. In such instances, both problems were recorded, each in its own category. Occasionally, students whose academic performance was satisfactory were noted to experience some of the above problems, particularly those related to difficult home situations. These cases were also recorded so as to give as complete a picture as possible of the extent to which each type of problem occurred in a given school.

Learning difficulties clearly constituted the major cause for poor classroom performance both in the regular classes and in the special education classes. In the regular classes this type of problem was most prominent in School 1 (32%) and least pronounced in School 2 (15%). Difficult home situations were seen as the second most frequent type of problem in Schools 2 and 3E (School 2 = 19% of the students in both regular and special education classes, School 3E = 18% in regular classes and 31% in special education classes). In School 1, home problems figured prominently in the special education classes (23%) whereas they affected only a small number of students in the regular classes (9%).In School 3F, which had only regular classes, the proportion of students in this category was also low (5%). The category comprising emotional, behavioral and social problems exhibited the most irregular pattern. In Schools 1 and 3E, this category comprised a high proportion of students in special education classes (32% and 26% respectively) and a relatively low proportion of students in regular classes (9% and 11% respectively). In School 2, the percentage of students in this category was 13% in the regular classes as well as in the special education classes. In School 3F, the proportion of these students was only 5%. Lack of concentration and/or motivation were most evident in the special education classes in School 2 (29%). In the regular classes in School 2 and in all the classes in the other three schools, the proportion of students in this

category did not exceed 10%. A similar pattern emerged with regard to health problems. Here again, close to one third of the students in the special education classes in School 2 (29%) were listed in this category, whereas there were only 6% or less in the other groups (for further details, see Table 3, Items 16a and 16b). Problems in language development constituted the least frequent type of problem and they occurred primarily in School 1 (7%).

In order to see to what extent school or program switching affects classroom performance, students were grouped according to whether they had or had not attended a different type of school or program previously. Special education classes were excluded from this analysis and transfer from such classes to the regular program were not considered here.

The results show that, the group who had not switched schools or programs contained proportionally more students whose performance was satisfactory than the group who had attended other schools or programs previously (School 1, no switch group = 61%, switch group = 42%; School 2, no switch group = 73%, switch group = 51%; School 3E, no switch group = 67%, switch group = 53%; School 3F, no switch group = 77%, switch group = 53%). Conversely, the group of students who had attended the same school from kindergarten onwards

contained proportionally fewer students who did not function satisfactorily in class than the group who had switched schools or programs (for exact percentages, see Table 4, Variable 1).

The pattern was less consistent when the students who had switched schools or programs were compared to one another according to whether the switch had occurred during the past two years or more than two years ago. In Schools 1 and 2, the proportion of students who functioned satisfactorily in the classroom was greater among the students who had switched over two years ago. In Schools 3E and 3F, the situation was reversed, i.e., the percentage of students whose performance was satisfactory was larger in the group that had switched within the last two years (see Table 4, Variable 2).

(3) The CTBS Results

The results from the Canadian Tests of Basic Skills were analyzed in three ways: (a) grade equivalent averages were computed for each grade, (b) a performance threshold was determined and the proportion of students functioning at or above this threshold was calculated and (c) the grade equivalent scores of students who had been in their respective schools since kindergarten were compared to those of

students who had joined these schools at a later stage. For this latter analysis, the transfer from French immersion to the English stream in School 3 was considered similar to a regular school transfer. Other program transfers such as the integration of students from special education classes into the regular classroom were excluded.

The threshold, which was established in consultation with professional staff, was designed to represent the minimum level at which a student needs to perform in order to follow the regular classroom curriculum. For grades 3-6, the threshold was fixed at six months below the expected grade level at the time of testing. For grades 1 and 2, the distance between the threshold and the expected norm was extended to eight and seven months respectively in order to make allowances for greater differences in growth patterns which are characteristic of younger learners.

The grade level equivalent scores show that the students' performance was generally better on the mathematics tests (concepts, problem solving and computation) than on the tests pertaining to language arts (vocabulary and reading). Nevertheless, with few exceptions, the scores on the language skills tests were still within three to four months of the expected norms (for the actual scores, see Table 5). Scores which were further below the norm occurred

only in School 2 (vocabulary in grades 2 and 5; reading in grades 2,3 and 5; math concepts and problem solving in grade 5) and in School 3E (vocabulary in grade 1; reading and problem solving in grades 4 and 6). The results also show that the grade equivalent scores of the students in School 3F were mostly higher than those of the students in the other schools.

In terms of threshold attainments, School 3F had the largest percentage of students who were performing at or above this level followed, in descending order, by School 1, School 3E and School 2. In each school the proportions were lowest in reading (School 3F = 70%, School 1 = 67%, School 3E = 60%, School 2 = 55%) and highest in computation (School 3F = 94%, Schools 1, 2 and 3E = 88% each). In Schools 2 and 3E, the percentage of students functioning at or above the threshold level in vocabulary was also relatively low (see Table 6).

The results pertaining to the comparison of students who did or did not switch schools show that the students who had not switched schools tended to score higher than those who had switched. This pattern was most consistent in School 1 where it applied to all the tests and at practically all the grade levels. In the other schools, there were several instances where there were either no differences between the

groups or where the group that had switched scored higher than the group that had not switched. The latter pattern was particularly noticeable on the vocabulary test scores in School 3E (for exact figures, see Table 7).

(4) The Survey of School Related Services

This survey was completed by the principal of each school. Since Schools 3E and 3F are in reality sections of the same administrative unit only one survey was filled in for both.

All three principals indicated that most of the services listed in the survey were either insufficient or not provided at all (see Table 8). Often a resource person managed to cover only one of his or her many functions because the workload in that domaine was too heavy. In School 1, for instance, testing services took up all the guidance counselor's time so that this person could, in fact, not attend to counseling duties. Schools 2 and 3 both stated that guidance and testing services were available but insufficient.

Schools 1 and 3 had speech and language development consultants but the time these specialists had at their disposal did not cover the needs of either school. School 2 had no such service at all.

Free flow teachers were available in Schools 2 and 3 though, here again, the provision of this service was not sufficient. School 1 did not have any such resource person. On the other hand, the latter school had some prep. classes whereas Schools 2 and 3 lacked this type of support.

None of the schools had any teacher aides and volunteers, when available (Schools 1 and 3), were insufficient in number.

A special education consultant, a social worker and a nurse were available in each school, however, only in School 1 did the services of these people meet the school's requirements.

Specialists in subject areas such as science were present only in School 3 and, even there, it was felt that this service was not extensive enough.

Neither School 1 nor School 3 had pre-kindergarten or extended kindergarten classes. School 2 had both but the principal indicated that he did not have enough pre-kindergarten classes.

An item which was not listed on the survey and which was requested by Schools 1 and 3 was crisis intervention.

In terms of priorities, School 1 and 2 indicated that crisis intervention was the service most urgently needed. Both schools also placed prep. classes high on their priority list because of the numerous transfers from French immersion and trilingual (School 1 only) programs. Teacher aides were in third place on the list in School 1 whereas free flow was listed in that slot in School 3.

In School 2, teacher aides were given top priority followed by a request for more free flow and more extensive social worker and guidance consultant services.

All the principals noted that the handling of severe behavioral and emotional problems was extremely difficult under the present conditions. On the academic side, the integration of children from special education classes into the regular classroom seemed to be the major issue. Some principals indicated that it was not only a matter of class size but also of the proportion of students with special needs already in the class and of the ability of the teacher to handle the additional load.

Another issue that was raised was the continuous transfer of new students into the school during the course of the year. The principals noted that this creates a situation whereby classes increase in size - sometimes beyond maximum

capacity - while staffing and services do not keep abreast with these changes. This factor was also in evidence in the present study where it was found that 8 to 10 new students had entered each of the three schools during the time that elapsed between the administration of the questionnaires and the testing of the students on the CTBS. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the principals had filled out the forms in November and that some of the services which they marked as insufficient or not provided may have been made available during the latter part of the year.

Summary and Discussion

The findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

I Factors Pertaining to the Home Environment

1. Schools 2 and 3E had a considerably larger proportion of single-parent families than Schools 1 and 3F. School 2 also had the largest number of students in foster or group homes. School 3F had no students in such homes.

2. The proportion of families with three or more children was largest in School 2 and smallest in School 3F.

3. School 2 had the highest percentage of parents born outside Quebec; Schools 3E and 3F had the lowest proportion of such parents.

4. The level of education of the parents (fathers and mothers) was highest in School 1 and lowest (mothers only) in School 2.

5. The percentage of fathers who were working full-time was significantly lower in School 2 than in the other three schools.

6. The proportion of heads of families with steady jobs was markedly lower in School 2 and 3E than in Schools 1 and 3F.

7. The use of social services was highest in School 3E and lowest in School 3F.

8. There were proportionally fewer families who engaged in leisure activities involving expenses in Schools 2 and 3E than in Schools 1 and 3F.

9. School 2 had the highest proportion of parents for whom the paying of school-related expenses was problematic and School 3F had the lowest proportion of such parents.

II Factors pertaining to the Students' Performance in School

1. Based on the teachers' informal evaluations, School 1 had the highest percentage of students whose classroom performance was not satisfactory and School 3F had the lowest percentage of such students.

2. Based on the CTBS results, Schools 2 and 3E had proportionally more students whose performance in vocabulary and reading was markedly below the expected norm than Schools 1 and 3F. School 3E also had a larger percentage of students who were below grade level in problem solving than the latter two schools. There were no marked differences in achievement among Schools 1, 2 and 3E on the other math tests (concepts and computation). On all the tests, the percentage of students who performed at or above the norm was higher in School 3F than in the other three schools.

3. Learning difficulties were given as the most frequent reason for poor academic performance and this problem was cited most often in School 1. Difficult home situations were the second most frequent type of problem and its occurrence was most often noted in Schools 2 and 3E. Emotional, behavioral and social problems ranked third in order of importance and these issues figured again more

prominently in Schools 2 and 3E than in the other two schools. School 3F had the lowest proportion of students with any type of problem.

4. Chronic absenteeism and/or tardiness were most pronounced in School 1 and least frequent in School 3F.

5. The transfer of students from other schools and/or programs occurred most often in School 1 and least often in School 3F. School 1 also had the highest proportion of transfers from schools and/or programs where instruction was mainly in a language other than the one of the receiving school. School 3E had fewer such transfers than School 1 but noticeably more than Schools 2 and 3F.

6. In all four schools, the percentage of students who functioned satisfactorily in the classroom was higher among students who had attended the same school since kindergarten than among those who had transferred into the school at a later stage.

The most noteworthy finding to emerge from this study is the sharp division between School 3E and School 3F, not only in terms of classroom performance, but also in terms of the factors related to the home environment. In fact, School 3E seems to rank closer to School 2 than to School 3F to

which it is administratively tied. Nevertheless, there are some points on which School 2 and School 3E differ from one another. These pertain mainly to items associated with socio-economic and cultural factors. Here, the data implies that the home background of the students in School 3E was socio-economically not as low as that in School 2. A possible reason for the difference may be that the proportion of parents born outside Canada was much larger in School 2 than in School 3E. Many of these parents had lived in the country for less than 10 years at the time the study was conducted and they may not yet have established themselves financially. Even the ones who had been here longer may not have integrated successfully into the local scene because of cultural differences between them and the Quebec society.

School 3F presents a very different profile. In terms of home environment, this school seemed to have the least problematic student population and this in spite of the fact that close to one third of the families were monoparental ones. However, there were no children here living in foster homes. In a related vein, chronic absenteeism, difficult home situations and the need for social services occurred infrequently in this school. Academically, the students in School 3F performed generally at a higher level than those in the other three schools even though most of the instruction they received was given in a language other than their

mother tongue. Here, a certain internal stability of the student population may have played a major role. On the one hand, there were not many students who transferred to School 3F from other schools or programs. This is natural since such a transfer necessitates a considerable knowledge of French in order to follow the curriculum. On the other hand, students in School 3F who could not cope with the French immersion program switched out of this program, thus leaving School 3F with an academically more select student body. Meanwhile, School 3E absorbed many of the weak students from School 3F and this may, in turn, have been one of the reasons why academic performance in the latter school was considerably lower than in School 3F. Furthermore, the presence of special education classes in School 3E meant a broader spectrum of students with various learning and emotional problems in that school than in School 3F.

School 1 seemed to be in a category of its own. In some respects, it was closer to School 3F than to Schools 2 and 3E, in others, the opposite held true. In addition, it exhibited certain characteristics which set it clearly apart from all three schools. Indices related to socio-economic factors suggest that monetary issues were not a major concern here. On the other hand, there were indications that the proportion of students who lived in difficult home situations was clearly much greater in School 1 than in

School 3F, though not as high as in Schools 2 and 3E. School 1 had also the highest percentage of students whose academic performance was judged unsatisfactory by their teachers. This situation may be attributable to the large number of children who transferred into this school from other institutions. Many of these students had previously attended trilingual private schools which meant that they had not been schooled as intensively in English as students who had attended regular English schools. Thus, there were often severe deficits in the development of English language skills here. Moreover, since the switch occurred, in most cases, only after the students had attended the trilingual schools for a number of years, there were frequently cumulative academic weaknesses in other subjects too, as attested by the relatively high proportion of repeaters in the middle and upper elementary grades. Interestingly, the results from the CTBS in School 1 were generally not lower than those in Schools 2 and 3E. Furthermore, on a number of tests, particularly those relating to language skills, the proportion of students who performed at or above the threshold, which had been posited as the minimum level of achievement needed to follow the regular curriculum, was higher in School 1 than in Schools 2 and 3E. It is possible that, in School 1, the teachers' perceptions of what constitutes a satisfactory level of academic achievement was considerably higher than the norms used by the CTBS. These expectations may have been motivated by the school's past history since this is a

school located in a middle to upper middle class neighbourhood, as well as by the fact that the students who were transferring from the trilingual schools also came from this kind of home background. In addition, the teachers' evaluations of classroom performance may have been influenced by factors such as frequent absenteeism, tardiness, lack of sleep etc. which were somewhat more pronounced in School 1 than in the other schools.

An issue that arises from the survey of available services is the fact that the provision of services was more frequently reported to be insufficient in School 3 than in Schools 1 and 2. This may be due to the fact that the combined student population in Schools 3E and 3F exceeded by far the number of students in each of the other two schools. Thus, there may be a greater need here than in Schools 1 and 2 to expand the existing services.

With respect to the instrument itself, several findings are of interest. First, the results obtained from the parent questionnaire paralleled closely those from the pupil information form with respect to the one question where these two forms overlapped, namely the proportions of two-parent and single-parent homes in each school. Thus, the parents who responded to the questionnaire appear to constitute a representative sample of the parent body in these schools.

Second, the high proportion of returns obtained from the parents suggests that the tool provides an efficient means for the collection of data pertaining to the students' home background. On the other hand, the instrument could be made more concise by eliminating questions which did not have sufficient discriminating power such as the one pertaining to the parents' place of work which showed that practically all the working parents held jobs outside the home irrespective of sex and school.

In a related vein, some items on the pupil information form need to be revised. Here, a central issue was that some teachers provided extensive information on certain questions, particularly the one pertaining to the underlying reasons for poor academic achievement, while others remained within the confines of the yes/no pattern given on the form. The insights provided by the teachers' comments strongly suggest that additional questions which will elicit such information uniformly be incorporated into the instrument.

The findings also seem to imply that the survey of school related services would be more effective if the listing of services already available specified the number of weekly hours the person dispensing a certain service devotes to this task. This information would make it possible to relate the provision of services to school size.

The resulting ratio could then be used as another factor in assessing the need for additional services in the different schools.

In conclusion, the findings of this study suggest that the instrument developed here can be used effectively for the drawing up of school profiles and that the information provided through these profiles makes it possible to rank schools in terms of the urgency of their needs. The findings also seem to imply that when a school comprises two very different types of programs, e.g., a French immersion stream and a regular English stream, a separate profile needs to be established for each program. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that only one of the schools in this study conformed to this model. It would seem advisable to extend the project to a greater number of such schools in order to support the conclusions drawn from this study.

REFERENCES

Adiv, E. (1982). Integrating into the French sector: an assessment of linguistic and academic achievement of grade 2 students from different ethnic backgrounds. Instructional Services Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Adiv, E. (1984). An example of double immersion. Language and Society, 12, 30-32.

Adiv, E. (1989). Jewish day school programs: an assessment of linguistic proficiency and academic achievement in multilingual settings. Studies in Jewish Education, Volume 2. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Adiv, E., & Boltuc, J. (1986). Assessment of the academic achievement and affective characteristics of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds in non-Inner City schools; Phase II. Inner City Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Adiv, E., & Boltuc, J. (1987). Assessment of the academic achievement and affective characteristics of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds in non-Inner City schools; Phase III. Inner City Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Adiv, E. & Doré, F. (1982). Evaluation des habilités langagières et du rendement académique des élèves francophones de troisième année du secteur français de la C.E.P.G.M. Services de l'enseignement, Commission des écoles protestantes du grand Montréal.

Adiv, E. & Doré, F. (1983). Integrating into the French sector: an assessment of linguistic and academic achievement of students from different ethnic backgrounds in grade 3. Instructional Services Department. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Adiv, E. & Doré, F. (1984). Integrating into the French sector: an assessment of linguistic and academic achievement of grade 4 students from different ethnic backgrounds. Instructional Services Department. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Adiv, E. & Doré, F. (1985). Assessment of the academic achievement and affective characteristics of pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds in non-Inner City Schools. Inner City Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Affleck, J. Q., Madge, S., Adams, A., & Lowenbraun, S. (1988). Integrated classroom versus resource model: academic viability and effectiveness. Exceptional Children, 54, 339-348.

Anderson, L. V. (1966). The effects of desegregation on the achievement and personality patterns of Negro children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, [cited in Stephan, 1978].

Bruck, M. (1978). The suitability of early French immersion programs for the language disabled child. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 34, 884-887.

Bruck, M., Rabinovitch, M. S., & Oates, M. (1975). The effect of French immersion programs on children with language disabilities - a preliminary report. Working Papers in Bilingualism, 5, 47-86.

Cohen, D. K., Pettigrew, T. F., & Riley, R. T. (1972). Race and the outcomes of schooling. In F. Mosteller & D. P. Mohynihan (Eds.), On equality of educational opportunity. New York: Random House.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D. & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Inc.

Consolidated special education policy statement. (1984). The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Fraser, E. D. (1955). Social factors in school progress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Aberdeen University [cited in Miller, 1971].

French students beat anglophones in writing test. (1989, May 24). Montreal Gazette.

Genesee, F. (1976). The suitability of immersion programs for all children. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 32, 494-515.

Genesee, F. (1978). Etudes et documents: Les programmes d'immersion en français du bureau des écoles protestantes du Grand Montréal. Service de recherche et expérimentation pédagogique. Gouvernement du Québec Ministère de l'Education.

Genesee, F. & Lambert, W. E. (1983). Trilingual education for majority children. Child Development, 54, 105-114.

Gerber, M. M. (1984) The Department of Education's sixth annual report to Congress on PL 94-142: Is Congress getting the full story? Exceptional Children, 51, 209-224.

Glavin, J., Quay, H., Annesley, F., & Werry, J. (1971). An experimental resource room for behaviour problem children. Exceptional Children, 38, 131-138.

Gresham, F. M. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: a review. Review of Educational Research, 51, 139-176.

Halsey, A. H. & Gardner, L. (1953) Selection for secondary education and achievement in grammar schools. British Journal of Sociology, 9.

Hanline, M. F. & Murray, C. (1984). Integrating severely handicapped children into regular public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 6, 273-6.

Les interventions pédagogiques en milieux économiques faibles: expériences américaines et autres. (1984). Ministère de l'Éducation, Québec.

Lapkin, S. & Swain, M. (1984). Research Update. Language and Society, 12, 48-54.

Macmillan, D. L. & Semmel, M. I. (1977). Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Focus on Exceptional Children, 9, 1-14.

Meyen, E. L. & Lehr, D. H. (1980). Least restrictive environments: instructional implications. Focus on Exceptional Children, 12, 1-8.

McPartland (1969). The relative influence of school desegregation on the academic achievement of ninth grade Negro students. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 93-102.

Miller, G. W. (1971). Educational opportunity and the home. London: Longman.

Nelson, C. M. (1988). Social skills training for mildly handicapped students. Teaching Exceptional Children, 20, 19-22

Noonan, M. J. & Hamphill, N. J. (1984). Comprehensive curricula for integrating severely disabled and nondisabled students. Focus on Exceptional Children, 17, 1-11.

Ross, R. & Rosenfield, R. (1988). Report of the special education integration sub-committee on a feasibility study on integration at the elementary level. Student Services Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Schoenell, F. J. (1956). School failure. The slow learning child, 3, University of Queensland Press.

The schools of Quebec: children with difficulties in learning and adaptation. Policy statement and plan of action. (1979). Service général des communications du Ministère de l'Éducation, Québec.

Smith, H. W. & Kennedy, W. (1967). Effects of three educational programs on mentally retarded children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 24, 174.

Special education procedures and practices. Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal. (1987). Student Services Department, The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Stallings, F. H. (1959). A study of the immediate effects of integration on scholastic achievement in the Louisville public schools. Journal of Negro Education, 28, 439-444.

Stephan, W. G. (1978). School desegregation: an evaluation of predictions made in Brown vs. Board of Education. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 217-238.

Sullivan, M. V. (1968). Discussion: implementing equal education opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 38, 148-155.

Trites, R. L. (1976). Learning disabilities in immersion. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 34, 888-889.

Wang, M. C. & Birch, J. W. (1984a). Effective special education in regular classes. Exceptional Children, 50, 391-398.

Wang, M. C. & Birch, J. W. (1984b). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. Exceptional Children, 51, 33-40.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER GRADE

	School 1	School 2	School 3E	School 3F
Kindergarten	14	33	-	57
Grade 1	31	34	26	47
Grade 2	30	34	22	50
Grade 3	35	30	20	48
Grade 4	33	21	26	45
Grade 5	53	31	30	37
Grade 6	59	26	41	29
Prep	16	-	-	-
LD 1	4	7	6	-
LD IV	12	24	33	-
LD V	11	-	-	-

TABLE 2

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES[a]

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) Parents Responding								
Mothers	169	77	103	76	110	83	183	81
Fathers	43	20	22	16	16	12	40	18
Guardians[b]	4	2	5	4	3	2	0	-
Not indicated	3	1	6	4	4	3	4	2
(2) Family Situation								
Two-parent home	157	72	70	52	68	51	153	67
Single parent home	59	27	64	47	63	47	71	31
Not indicated	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	1
(3) Children in the Family								
One	30	14	24	18	30	23	54	24
Two	103	47	45	33	52	39	110	49
Three	56	26	44	32	40	30	49	22
More than 3	28	13	22	16	10	8	14	6

School 3E = English sector
School 3F = French immersion sector

[a] Because of rounding off procedures: (1) percentages within a category do not always add up to 100 and (2) no percentage is shown when the number of people in a group accounts for less than .05% of the population on which the calculations are based (applies to all tables).

[b] Includes other relative

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(4) PSBGM Schools[a]								
Yes	165	75	120	88	115	87	203	89
No	51	23	16	12	17	13	20	9
Not indicated	3	1	0	-	1	1	4	2
(5) Private Schools[b]	34	16	2	2	0	-	3	1
(6) Parents' Birth Place								
In Quebec	92	42	29	21	66	50	116	51
Outside Quebec	15	7	12	9	11	8	15	7
Outside Canada	110	50	92	68	55	41	95	42
Not indicated	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	-
(7) Length of Stay in Quebec								
Less than 5 years	14	6	11	8	4	3	1	-
5 to 10 years	7	3	16	12	4	3	4	2
More than 10 years	100	46	79	58	59	44	104	46
Not indicated	6	3	1	1	0	-	2	1

[a] Number of families with all school-age children in PSBGM schools

[b] Number of families with one or more children in private schools

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(8) First Language Spoken with Children								
English	183	84	120	89	126	95	206	91
French	9	4	3	2	3	2	5	2
Other	23	11	10	7	4	3	15	7
Not indicated	4	2	3	2	0	-	1	-
(9) Second Language Spoken with Children								
English	19	9	6	4	5	4	17	8
French	25	11	10	7	12	9	58	26
Other	14	7	6	4	2	2	12	5
None	161	74	114	84	114	86	140	62
(10) Mother's Level of Education								
Elementary	11	7	13	13	10	9	11	6
Secondary	40	24	45	44	53	48	82	45
CEGEP	22	13	16	16	10	9	21	12
University	66	39	11	11	17	16	39	21
Other	24	14	15	15	15	14	21	12
Not indicated	6	4	3	3	5	5	9	5
(11) Father's Level of Education								
Elementary	4	9	1	5	1	6	2	5
Secondary	4	9	7	32	7	44	11	28
CEGEP	5	12	3	14	1	6	7	18
University	29	67	9	41	4	25	16	40
Other	1	2	2	9	1	6	11	10
Not indicated	0	-	0	-	2	13	0	-

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(12) Mother's Work Patterns[a]								
Full-time	67	33	55	47	58	48	120	56
Part-time	51	25	15	13	13	11	21	10
Occasionally	18	9	8	7	5	4	15	7
Not at all	70	34	40	34	44	37	60	28
(13) Mother's Workplace[a]								
Outside home	124	93	70	93	70	96	145	96
At home	9	7	5	7	3	4	6	4
(14) Father's Work Patterns[a]								
Full-time	139	91	59	84	60	95	135	90
Part-time	4	3	1	1	0	-	6	4
Occasionally	3	2	2	3	0	-	3	2
Not at all	6	4	8	11	3	5	6	4
(15) Father's Workplace[a]								
Outside Home	136	94	60	95	58	98	138	98
At home	9	6	3	5	1	2	3	2

[a] Figures include spouses of two-parent families who did not complete the questionnaire themselves; missing cases are excluded because of cross-tabulation.

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(16) Read a Daily Paper								
Always	176	80	96	71	100	75	161	71
Sometimes	6	3	7	5	3	2	11	5
Never	31	14	22	16	22	17	49	22
Not indicated	6	3	11	8	8	6	6	3
(17) Read Periodicals								
Many (5 or more)	37	17	14	10	18	14	26	12
Few (1-4)	128	58	82	60	62	47	139	61
None	11	5	9	7	15	11	21	9
Not indicated	43	20	31	23	38	29	41	18
(18) Books in Home								
Many	205	94	122	90	114	86	211	93
Few or none	10	5	9	7	11	8	7	3
Not indicated	4	2	5	4	8	6	9	4
(19) Attend Community Activities[a]								
Adult Ed. Classes	47	22	28	21	26	20	48	21
Dances	10	5	18	13	17	13	34	15
Bingo	7	3	8	6	17	13	21	9
Other	30	14	13	10	4	3	36	16
None	126	58	71	52	68	51	114	50
Not indicated	19	9	9	7	14	11	16	7

[a] Percentages on this item are greater than 100 since some respondents indicated more than one activity.

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(20) Involvement in School Activities[a]								
Committee meetings	66	30	49	36	32	24	66	29
School projects	42	19	31	23	20	15	48	21
Par./teach. meetings	208	95	114	84	122	92	212	93
(21) Sports Activities[a]								
Equipment required	157	72	64	47	73	55	143	63
No equipment	156	71	75	55	80	60	141	62
Minimal equipment	38	17	27	20	25	19	45	20
Indoor sports	23	11	3	2	2	2	11	5
None	30	14	25	18	17	13	38	17
Not indicated	7	3	10	7	13	10	16	7
(22) Travel out of Montreal Last Year								
Yes	170	78	97	72	106	80	193	85
No	44	20	33	24	23	17	32	14
Not indicated	5	2	6	4	4	3	2	1

[a] Percentages on Items 20 and 21 are calculated independently for each activity.

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(23) Travel Alone or with Family								
Alone	21	10	20	15	17	13	16	7
With family	142	65	81	60	81	61	162	71
Both	16	7	2	2	6	5	14	6
Not indicated	40	18	33	24	29	22	35	15
(24) Entire Summer in Montreal								
Yes	77	35	63	46	49	37	65	29
No	129	59	62	46	72	54	151	67
Sometimes	5	2	4	3	8	6	7	3
Not indicated	8	4	7	5	4	3	4	2
(25) Duration of Family Trips[a]								
Less than 1 week	29	19	23	29	15	17	31	18
One week	36	24	18	23	26	30	59	34
Two weeks	70	46	28	35	37	43	74	42
More than two weeks	17	11	10	13	8	9	11	6

[a] Percentages based on number of respondents who traveled with their families include those who indicated "both".

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(26) Means of Transportation[a]								
Plane	88	49	48	47	31	30	60	31
Train	7	4	8	8	12	12	16	8
Bus	10	6	23	22	14	14	8	4
Car	115	64	53	52	70	67	144	75
(27) Dental Care								
Family Dentist	196	90	111	82	116	87	209	92
Dental Clinic	10	5	15	12	14	11	13	6
Neither	9	4	6	4	3	2	2	1
Not indicated	4	2	3	2	0	-	3	1

[a] Percentages on this item are greater than 100 since some parents indicated more than one means of transportation.

TABLE 3

RESULTS FROM THE PUPIL INFORMATION FORMS

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1) Family Situation								
Two-Parent home	212	71	124	52	105	52	212	68
Single-Parent home	67	23	98	41	89	44	99	32
Guardian[a]	12	4	11	5	2	1	2	1
Parent & new partner	5	2	0	-	4	2	0	-
Foster/Group home	2	1	6	3	4	2	0	-
Not known	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-
(2) Dwelling Conditions								
Adequate	232	78	147	61	105	52	231	74
Poor	50	17	48	20	15	7	13	4
Not known	16	5	45	19	84	41	69	22
(3) Steady Job								
Yes	238	80	146	61	134	66	252	81
No	50	17	62	26	48	24	41	13
Not known	10	3	32	13	22	11	20	6
(4) Paying of School Expenses								
Not problematic	227	76	145	60	152	75	280	90
Problematic	65	22	92	38	52	26	28	9
Sometimes probl.	5	2	0	-	0	-	0	-
Not known	1	-	3	1	0	-	5	2

[a] Includes living with a relative

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PUPIL INFORMATION FORMS

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(5) Attendance Problems								
No problem	260	87	221	92	188	92	295	94
Chronically absent	23	8	14	6	14	7	8	3
Chronically late	8	3	2	1	1	1	2	1
Often both	7	2	2	1	1	1	8	3
Not known	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-
(6) Food and Sleep Issues								
No problem	256	86	224	93	195	96	299	96
Seems hungry	40	13	8	3	6	3	6	2
Sometimes hungry	0	-	6	3	1	1	8	3
Sleepy	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	-
Sleepy & hungry	2	1	1	-	1	1	0	-
Not known	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-
(7) Social Services								
Not necessary	247	83	205	85	168	82	295	94
Social worker	15	5	18	8	28	14	9	3
Outside service	8	3	11	5	3	2	2	1
Used in past	12	4	2	1	3	2	1	-
Proposed	5	2	2	1	1	1	1	-
Not known	11	4	2	1	1	1	5	2

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PUPIL INFORMATION FORMS

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(8) School Switching								
Switched	221	74	108	45	87	43	47	15
Did not switch	77	26	132	55	117	57	266	85
(9) Location of Previous School[a]								
PSBGM	77	35	61	57	52	59	28	60
Other School Board	24	11	21	19	21	24	19	40
Private sector	95	43	2	2	3	3	0	-
Special Ed. Centres	6	3	4	4	3	3	0	-
Outside Montreal	19	8	19	18	8	10	0	-
Not indicated	0	-	1	1	0	-	0	-
(10) Type of School[a]								
English	85	38	74	69	70	80	8	17
French	13	6	5	5	5	6	8	17
Immersion	24	11	15	14	9	10	29	62
Trilingual	84	38	1	1	0	-	0	-
Other	15	7	12	11	3	4	0	-
Not indicated	0	-	1	-	0	-	2	4
(11) Time of Switch[a]								
2 years ago or less	121	55	89	82	58	67	32	68
More than 2 years	100	45	19	18	29	33	15	32

[a] Percentages based on number of students who switched

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PUPIL INFORMATION FORMS

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(12) Program Switching Within Same School								
Switched	37	12	7	3	59	29	0	-
Did not switch	261	88	231	96	145	71	312	99
Not indicated	0	-	2	1	0	-	1	-
(13) Type of Program[a]								
Immersion	0	-	0	-	57	97	0	-
English	7	19	0	-	2	3	0	-
Prep. Classes	24	65	0	-	0	-	0	-
Special Ed.	6	16	7	100	0	-	0	-
(14) Time of Switch[a]								
2 years ago or less	25	68	7	100	38	64	0	-
More than 2 years	12	32	0	-	21	36	0	-

[a] Percentages based on number of students who switched

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

RESULTS FROM THE PUPIL INFORMATION FORMS

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(15) Classroom Performance								
Satisfactory	113	38	117	49	89	44	226	72
Probl. in reg. Classes	143	47	92	38	76	37	87	28
Probl. in Special Ed.	42	14	31	13	39	19	NA	NA
(16a) Problems in Regular Classes[a,b]								
Learning difficulties	83	32	32	15	37	22	49	16
Emot./behav./social	24	9	27	13	18	11	16	5
Concent./motivat.	10	4	17	8	15	9	15	5
Language problems	19	7	5	2	5	3	6	2
Health problems	15	6	6	3	1	1	4	1
Home problems	21	8	40	19	30	18	14	5
Unidentified	1	-	2	1	1	1	3	1
(16b) Problems in Sp. Ed. Classes[a,b]								
Learning difficulties	31	70	31	100	39	100	NA	NA
Emot./behav./social	14	32	4	13	10	26	NA	NA
Concent./motivat.	3	7	9	29	1	3	NA	NA
Health problems	2	5	9	29	1	3	NA	NA
Home problems	10	23	6	19	12	31	NA	NA
Unidentified	0	-	9	29	0	-	NA	NA

NA = not applicable

[a] Percentages are based on total number of students in either regular classes (Item 16a) or Spec. Ed. classes (Item 16b) and are calculated independently for each type of problem.

[b] Total number of cases exceeds number of students with problems shown under Item 15 because those with multiple problems are listed in each category that applies to them.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WHO SWITCHED AND STUDENTS WHO DID NOT SWITCH[a]

	School 1				School 2				School 3E				School 3F			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Variable 1	Switch		No Switch		Switch		No Switch		Switch		No Switch		Switch		No Switch	
Satisfactory	77	42	44	61	39	51	97	73	57	53	40	67	25	53	204	77
Unsatisfactory	106	58	28	39	38	49	35	27	50	47	20	33	22	47	62	23
Variable 2	Switch within 2 yrs		Switch over 2 yrs		Switch within 2 yrs		Switch over 2 yrs		Switch within 2 yrs		Switch over 2 yrs		Switch within 2 yrs		Switch over 2 yrs	
Satisfactory	40	40	37	45	32	48	7	67	39	56	18	49	20	63	5	33
Unsatisfactory	61	60	45	55	35	52	3	33	31	44	19	51	12	38	10	67

[a] Includes only students in regular classes.

TABLE 5

GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGES ON CTBS

	School 1	School 2	School 3E	School 3F
Vocabulary				
Grade 1	19	21	15	NA
Grade 2	23	20	22	NA
Grade 3	33	31	33	37
Grade 4	44	45	40	47
Grade 5	54	45	56	61
Grade 6	67	65	62	67
Reading				
Grade 1	19	20	14	NA
Grade 2	23	20	23	NA
Grade 3	34	29	35	35
Grade 4	43	44	40	43
Grade 5	52	50	54	55
Grade 6	63	62	60	66
Math Concepts				
Grade 1	20	25	18	NA
Grade 2	30	27	32	NA
Grade 3	38	33	36	40
Grade 4	44	47	44	52
Grade 5	56	48	57	61
Grade 6	64	66	65	75

TABLE 5 (cont'd)

GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGES ON CTBS

	School 1	School 2	School 3E	School 3F
Problem Solving				
Grade 1	23	24	19	NA
Grade 2	28	27	34	NA
Grade 3	37	35	36	40
Grade 4	45	43	39	46
Grade 5	51	46	52	57
Grade 6	64	62	59	71
Computations				
Grade 1	21	27	19	NA
Grade 2	32	34	35	NA
Grade 3	40	38	41	40
Grade 4	52	50	48	53
Grade 5	59	56	58	62
Grade 6	65	68	68	71

NA = not applicable

[a] Only regular classes were tested.
In Schools 1, 2 and 3E, grades 3 - 6 were tested in February and grades 1 - 2 in May.
In School 3F, grades 4 - 6 were tested in February, grade 3 was tested in May and grades 1 - 2 were not tested since all instruction in these grades is in French.

TABLE 6

THRESHOLD ATTAINMENTS ON CTBS[a,b]

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Vocabulary								
Above threshold	159	72	96	59	90	59	122	84
Below threshold	63	28	66	41	62	41	24	16
Reading								
Above threshold	152	67	88	55	92	60	103	70
Below threshold	73	32	72	45	61	40	44	30
Math Concepts								
Above threshold	166	74	115	72	107	75	133	93
Below threshold	57	26	45	28	35	25	10	7
Problem Solving								
Above threshold	162	73	114	72	95	65	126	87
Below threshold	61	27	44	28	51	35	19	13
Computation								
Above threshold	192	88	140	88	134	88	138	94
Below threshold	27	12	19	12	18	12	9	6

[a] Threshold refers to a cut-off point positioned at 6-8 months below the expected grade level.

[b] Number of students within a school varies across tests because some students did not take all the tests.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF CTBS RESULTS OF STUDENTS WHO SWITCHED AND STUDENTS WHO DID NOT SWITCH

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch
Vocabulary								
Grade 1	19	19	19	21	16	13	NA	NA
Grade 2	22	26	20	21	24	18	NA	NA
Grade 3	31	38	31	31	33	31	35	37
Grade 4	41	50	43	46	40	38	45	47
Grade 5	53	55	43	46	55	57	56	62
Grade 6	65	75	65	65	63	61	66	67
Reading								
Grade 1	20	19	19	20	14	14	NA	NA
Grade 2	22	26	20	21	23	24	NA	NA
Grade 3	33	38	30	28	35	36	37	35
Grade 4	42	44	39	45	41	39	41	44
Grade 5	51	56	46	52	51	58	53	56
Grade 6	62	70	63	62	62	58	66	66
Math Concepts								
Grade 1	18	21	24	26	17	19	NA	NA
Grade 2	29	31	26	28	31	38	NA	NA
Grade 3	36	43	33	33	37	29	40	40
Grade 4	42	49	47	47	44	46	49	53
Grade 5	56	60	43	51	56	58	57	62
Grade 6	62	71	63	68	64	66	73	76

TABLE 7 (cont'd)

COMPARISON OF CTBS RESULTS OF STUDENTS WHO SWITCHED AND STUDENTS WHO DID NOT SWITCH

	School 1		School 2		School 3E		School 3F	
	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch	Switch	No Switch
Problem Solving								
Grade 1	21	25	24	24	18	21	NA	NA
Grade 2	28	30	28	26	32	41	NA	NA
Grade 3	35	44	34	35	38	24	39	40
Grade 4	43	52	44	43	40	36	45	47
Grade 5	51	54	44	48	51	53	53	58
Grade 6	62	71	64	60	55	61	70	72
Computations								
Grade 1	20	21	27	27	19	20	NA	NA
Grade 2	32	34	32	37	35	37	NA	NA
Grade 3	38	46	38	38	42	36	41	40
Grade 4	52	54	52	50	47	50	52	53
Grade 5	58	63	52	59	56	60	60	62
Grade 6	64	68	67	69	65	70	74	71

NA = not applicable

TABLE 8

RESULTS FROM THE SURVEY OF SCHOOL RELATED SERVICES

	School 1		School 2		School 3 (E & F)	
	PI	NP	PI	NP	PI	NP
Guidance Consultation		X	X		X	
Testing Services	Sufficient		X		X	
Special Ed. Consultation	Sufficient		X		X	
Speech & Lang. Development	X			X	X	
Free Flow		X	X		X	
Prep Classes	X			X		X
Teacher Aides (academic work)		X		X		X
Teacher Aides (other activities)		X		X		X
Volunteers	X			X	X	
Specialists in Science, etc.		X		X	X	
Social Worker	Sufficient		X		X	
Crisis Intervention		X	Not requested		X	
Nurse	Sufficient		X		X	
Pre-Kindergarten Classes		X	X			X
Extended Kindergarten		X	Sufficient			X

PI = Provided but insufficient
NP = Not provided

FIN